UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,718	04/21/2004	David A. Hill	030728 (BLL-0181)	4760

36192 7590 04/30/2008
CANTOR COLBURN LLP - BELLSOUTH
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER	
RAYYAN, SUSAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/828,718	**Applicant(s)** HILL, DAVID A.	
	Examiner SUSAN FOSTER RAYYAN	**Art Unit** 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)□ This action is non-final.

3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)□ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)□ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:

1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) □ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) □ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2003/0074463 issued to Stephen J. Swartz et al in view of US 2003/0061062 issued to Timothy J. Tucker.

As per independent claim 1 Swartz teaches a method for integrating service request generation systems with a service order control system (see Abstract), comprising:

converting data in a service request into an … format resulting in a converted service request (paragraph 193, lines 1-12 as submit a service request to a wrapper to perform required formatting and translation before forwarding the request) ;

validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic (paragraph 125 validate requests and paragraph 82 as business rule), the validating including:

performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request (paragraph 125 as validate requests); and

performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request (paragraph 125 as validates requests such as request content, type and destination);

resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request (paragraph 138 as error management);

generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application and transmitting the service order to the service order control application (paragraph 193 as wrapper formats and translates before forwarding request and the requests sent to Local Service Provider are converted into LSOG format and forwarded to the command processor, Figure 9).

Swartz does not explicitly teach open data format and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source. Tucker teaches open data format as XML at paragraph 44-45 and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source (paragraph 52, as preprocessing and post processing to prepare the transaction for transformation including check user against look-up table of acceptable users, and paragraph 45, as verifying requested fields are present and evaluate data to be processed) and (at paragraph 76 and Figure 9) receiving a transformed transaction (claimed converted service request), preprocessing (for the claimed errors and inconsistencies) and transforming back into the original language and syntax of the requestor and transmit back to the original requestor. In addition at paragraph 71, Tucker indicates that should a transformation fail or data is corrupted the original stored transaction would be used to restart the transaction.

Tucker teaches the ability to pre-process (validate-check for errors) a transaction (service request) and pre-process (validate –check for errors) a transformed transaction (converted service request). Tucker teaches transforming a transformed transaction (converting a converted service request) to an original format and transmit back to the original requestor to provide disparate computer systems means to interchange data seamlessly. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to modify Swartz with open data format and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source to provide disparate computer systems means to interchange data seamlessly (paragraph 19, lines 1-3) as taught by Tucker.

As per claim 2 same as claim arguments above and Swartz teaches:
modifying the user-defined business logic to accommodate at least one of:
a new or modified service offered, a new or modified product offered and
a new or modified business requirement (paragraph 82, as business rules are implemented as modifiable and paragraph 101 as order management business rules).

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Tucker teaches:
wherein the performing accuracy checks of data fields and data include:
checking for missing data in the data fields, checking for incomplete data in the data fields, and checking for data format errors (paragraphs 44-45, as validate data, data evaluated for accuracy, and other checks and evaluations of the data may be performed including verifying data fields are present).

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Tucker teaches:
wherein the performing consistency checks of data and data fields include:
checking a first data field within said converted service request against subsequent data fields within the converted service request, wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields(paragraphs 44-45, as validate data, data evaluated for accuracy, and

other checks and evaluations of the data may be performed including verifying data fields are present).

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Swartz teaches:
wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes flagging said converted service request for correction, and notifying said corresponding service request source of corrective action to be taken (paragraph 138, as errors fixed at source).

As per claim 6 same as claim arguments above and Swartz teaches:
wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes querying an external source of information (paragraph 136-138, as error management).

As per claim 7 same as claim arguments above and Swartz teaches:
wherein the external source of information includes at least one of: a central office service resource storing available service offerings (paragraph 138, as errors fixed at the source and system administrator allows requests to be put back in the flow process after updates).

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Tucker teaches:
wherein the open data format includes eXtensible markup language (paragraph 44-45, as XML).

As per independent claim 11 Swartz teaches:

A system for integrating service request generation systems with a service order control system (see Abstract), comprising:

server executing a service order control application (Figure 9);

a data repository in communication with the server (Figure 2);

a service order generator executing on the server, the service order generator l(Figure 9, Reference Number 940) including :

a service request normalizer (Figure 9, Reference Number 925);

a rules engine comprising (Figure 2, Reference Number 240):

a customer/service validation module (Figure9); and

a service order writer (Figure 2);

a link to at least one service request source (Figure 2, 9);

wherein the service order generator performs: converting data in a service request received from the at least one service order source into an … format resulting in a converted service request paragraph 193, lines 1-12 as submit a service request to a wrapper to perform required formatting and translation before forwarding the request) ;

validating the converted service request utilizing user- defined business logic(paragraph 125 validate requests and paragraph 82 as business rule), the validating including:

performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request paragraph 125 as validate requests);

and performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request (paragraph 125 as validates requests such as request content , type and destination);

resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request(paragraph 138 as error management);

generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application;

transmitting the service order to the service and order control application(paragraph 193 as wrapper formats and translates before forwarding request and the requests sent to Local Service Provider are converted into LSOG format and forwarded to the command processor, Figure 9).

Swartz does not explicitly teach open data format, a field validation module and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes : converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source. Tucker teaches open data format as XML at paragraph 44-45 , a field validation module and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source (paragraph 52, as preprocessing and post processing to prepare the transaction for transformation including check user against look-up table of acceptable users, and paragraph 45, as verifying requested fields are present and evaluate data to be processed) and (at paragraph 76 and Figure 9) receiving a transformed transaction (claimed converted service request), preprocessing (for the claimed errors and inconsistencies) and transforming back into the original language and syntax of the requestor and transmit back to the original requestor. In addition at paragraph 71, Tucker indicates that should a transformation fail or data is corrupted the original stored transaction would be used to restart the transaction.

Tucker teaches the ability to pre-process (validate-check for errors) a transaction (service request) and pre-process (validate –check for errors) a transformed transaction (converted service request) . Tucker teaches transforming a transformed transaction (converting a converted service request) to an original format and transmit back to the original requestor to provide disparate computer systems means to interchange data seamlessly. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention was made to modify Swartz with open data format and wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format, and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source to provide disparate computer systems means to interchange data seamlessly (paragraph 19, lines 1-3) as taught by Tucker.

As per claim 20 same as claim arguments above and Swartz teaches:

wherein the service requests are stored in a queue(paragraph 218 message queue).

Claim 10 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 12-18 are rejected based on the same rationale as claims 2-9.

Claims 9,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz in view of Tucker as applied to claims 1, 11 above, and further in view of US 6,937,993 B1 issued to Swathibabu Gabbita et al ("Gabbita").

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Swartz and Tucker do not explicitly teach wherein the generating a service order includes: querying a service scheduling resource to identify an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested including a selected service date in said service order. Gabbita does teach this limitation (column 9, lines 34-37 as scheduling service orders and column 9, lines 45-55 as customer due dates and service order scheduled) to immediately determine information about delay and take corrective action before it becomes critical. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention made to modify Swartz and Tucker with wherein the generating a service order includes:

querying a service scheduling resource to identify an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested including a selected service date in said service order) to immediately determine information about delay and take corrective action before it becomes critical (column 3, lines 6-8) as taught by Gabbita.

Claim 19 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 9.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 16, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Tucker does not explicitly teach converting the converted service request back to its original data format and transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service source.
Upon further review of Tucker Examiner respectfully disagrees.
Tucker teaches (at paragraph 76 and Figure 9) receiving a transformed transaction (claimed converted service request), preprocessing (for the claimed errors and inconsistencies) and transforming back into the original language and syntax of the requestor and transmit back to the original requestor. In addition at paragraph 71, Tucker indicates that should a transformation fail or data is corrupted the original stored transaction would be used to restart the transaction.

Tucker teaches the ability to pre-process (validate-check for errors) a transaction (service request) and pre-process (validate –check for errors) a transformed transaction (converted service request) . Tucker teaches transforming a transformed transaction (converting a converted service request) to an original format and transmit back to the original requestor.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Rayyan

April 21, 2008

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167